Association of Bay Area Governments
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
P.O. Box 2050
Oakland, CA 94607-4756
(510) 464-7942
fax: (510) 433-5542
tedd@abag.ca.gov
abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy/

Joint Policy Committee

Friday, January 19, 2007
10:00 a.m. to 12:00 Noon
MetroCenter Auditorium
101 Eighth Street, Oakland

AGENDA

1. Call to Order

---

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

2.1 Approval of Joint Policy Committee Meeting Minutes of November 17, 2006 — Action

2.2 Proposed Amendments to Smart-Growth Policies — Action
> This item was discussed in September and November, but action was deferred in November as a quorum was not present during the part of the meeting at which this item was considered. The recommendations include Committee suggestions from the two previous meetings.

2.3 JPC Composition and Size — Action
> The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) has requested membership on the Joint Policy Committee. The staff memo recommends that staff report back on legislative and Committee size and composition options in March.

> *Unless there is a request by a Committee member to take up an item on the consent calendar separately, the calendar will be acted upon in one motion.*

---

3. 2007 *FOCUS* Program — Action
> Staff is seeking JPC concurrence with the 2007 *Focusing our Vision (FOCUS)* program and process.

4. *FOCUS* Incentives: Legislation and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) — Action
> Legislation is required to activate the infill incentives contained in the bond propositions approved by the voters in November. The staff memo recommends principles to guide legislative advocacy. The memo also alerts the Committee to the incentive potential in the next Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

5. Climate Change Strategy — Discussion
> Staff will provide a status report on the JPC's program to address

climate-change issues. Included will be a presentation of possible transportation measures.

6. Public Comment

7. Adjournment

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING:
10:00 a.m. to Noon
Friday, March 16, 2006
MetroCenter Auditorium
101 Eighth Street, Oakland

The JPC may take action on any item listed in the agenda.

This meeting is scheduled to end promptly at 12:00 Noon. Agenda items not considered by that time may be deferred.

The public is encouraged to comment on agenda items by completing a request-to-speak card and giving it to JPC staff or the chairperson.

Although a quorum of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission may be in attendance at this meeting, the Joint Policy Committee may take action only on those matters delegated to it. The Joint Policy Committee may not take any action as the Metropolitan Transportation Commission unless this meeting has been previously noticed as a Metropolitan Transportation Commission meeting.

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
P.O. Box 2050
Oakland, CA 94607-4756
(510) 464-7942
fax: (510) 433-5542
tedd@abag.ca.gov
abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy/

Association of Bay Area Governments
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Joint Policy Committee

Minutes of the Meeting of November 17, 2006
Held at 10:00 AM in the MetroCenter Auditorium, Oakland

Attendance:

ABAG Members:	BAAQMD Members:	MTC Members:
Mark Green	Chris Daly	Sue Lempert
Scott Haggerty	Jerry Hill	John McLemore
Steve Rabinowitsh	Michael Shimansky	Jon Rubin, Ch.
Gwen Regalia	Pamela Torliatt	Shelia Young
	Gayle Uilkema, V. Ch.	

ABAG Staff:	BAAQMD Staff:	MTC Staff:
Henry Gardner	Jean Roggenkamp	Betty Cecchini
Patricia Jones	Ana Sandoval	Therese McMillan
Kenneth Kirkey		

Other: JPC Staff:
  Ratna Amin, City of Oakland   Ted Droettboom
  Linda Craig, League of Women Voters
  Irvin Dawid, Sierra Club
  Jean Finney, Caltrans, District 4
  Rich Hedges, MTC Advisory Council and EDAC
  Patrick Hoge, San Francisco Chronicle
  Lindy Lowe, BCDC
  Steve Lowe, WOCA
  Peter Lydon, SPUR
  Val Menotti, BART
  Alec McDonald, Bay Area Monitor
  Bob Planthold
  Bruce Riordan, Elmwood Consulting
  David Schonbrunn, TRANSDEF
  Will Travis, BCDC

1.   Call to Order

          Chair Rubin called the meeting to order.

2.   Approval of Joint Policy Committee Meeting Minutes of September 22, 2006

          The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

3.   Global Climate Change

Ted Droettboom presented a slide show summarizing the potential implications of climate change for California and the Bay Area, putting the Bay Area's contributions to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in world context, and recommending next steps toward building a regional climate change strategy.   The presentation is available on the JPC website: http://www.abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy/jpc_presentations.htm.

Discussion touched on a number of ideas:

- The necessity to coordinate the JPC effort with other regional and local efforts (including those of special-purpose districts) already underway; to learn from these efforts, and avoid duplication;

- The desirability of integrating GHG considerations into other ongoing regional work (e.g., calculating GHG contributions attributable to Proposition 1B and other transportation projects; continuing our efforts to reduce growth in VMT);

- The interaction among global warming changes and other areas of continuing regional concern (e.g., an increase in wild fires will have significant effects on air quality, especially PM concentrations);

- The potential for tradeoffs between climate change strategies and other environmental objectives, requiring assessments of net benefits and costs to the local environment versus those accruing to the globe;

- The observation that, while there are many local governments and a some states undertaking climate-change initiatives, there are few if any U.S. regional entities active in this area; the Bay Area will have to lead;

- The potential utility of incentives to induce GHG emissions;

- The desirability of unambiguously clear state targets;

- A recognition that sea-level rise threatens a significant portion of our existing transportation infrastructure (including freeways, railroads, and airports); the cost of taking preventive action needs to be compared to the cost of protecting or rebuilding these expensive facilities;

- The potential for the region to exhibit leadership and educate;

- The need to pioneer new models of public involvement around this issue, being wary of traditional negative involvement models which will stall progress;

- The importance of smartness: smart growth, smart transit, smart driving, and smart cars;

- The recognition that there are inter-regional, as well as regional; aspects to this issue;

- The observation that this is a very complex issue with many interrelationships and alternative paths; it will be easy to lose focus if we are not mindful of the most important areas in which we can be effective; a focus on a few clear goals and tangible actions will be required.

The Committee adopted the recommendations in the staff memo.

4.　　Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) and *Projections 2007*

Paul Fassinger reported on the draft methodology for determining local allocations for the next RHNA cycle and on *Projections 2007*, the regional population and jobs forecast which underlies that methodology and is intended to be used, as well, for the next Regional Transportation Plan. As with the two previous forecasts, *Projections 2007* is based on smart-growth policy. It assumes that local land-use plans will be modified to steer more development toward existing communities, near job concentrations and near transit infrastructure.

The draft RHNA methodology also pursues smart-growth objectives by including employment and transit availability as allocation factors. More information on the draft RHNA methodology is available on the ABAG website: http://www.abag.ca.gov/planning/housingneeds.

The JPC did not endorse a single, consolidated position on either the draft RHNA methodology or *Projections 2007* but requested that the concerns of the Committee's individual members and others speaking at the JPC meeting be summarized and conveyed to the ABAG Executive Board for its consideration. In summary, some of those in attendance at the JPC meeting were concerned about:

- The absence of a clear nexus between local housing responsibility and regional funding to support that responsibility (not just for housing itself, but for housing-supportive infrastructure, like transportation), noting that RHNA was an inadequate, incomplete and potentially punitive lever for achieving smart growth;

- The lack of transparency in the link between regional projections and the growth anticipated in local land-use plans, acknowledging that most local plans do not extend to the 2035 horizon of the projections;

- The apparent ambiguity and possible conflict between the "goal" as expressed in the projection-derived RHNA allocations and "reality" as defined by what is possible on the ground;

- The asymmetry introduced into regional and local planning processes because RHNA allocates housing but not employment and because housing is allocated to a jurisdiction without regard to its location in that jurisdiction and particularly its proximity to the jobs in that jurisdiction or neighboring jurisdictions;

- The need to incentivize not just housing, but the vertical integration of uses;

- The conceptualization of RHNA as a largely technical, staff-driven process with insufficient involvement of elected officials, even though some locally-elected officials did participate in the Housing Methodology Committee;

- The opaqueness of the projections process and of the manner in which the underlying policy assumptions are applied;

- The potential folly of assigning increased housing allocations to jurisdictions with planned transit extensions which may not materialize;

- The disconnect between regional objectives and the general public, who still do not buy-in to increased housing in their communities.

No resolutions on any of these concerns were put or adopted.

5.   *Focusing Our Vision (FOCUS)* Progress and Proposed Amendments to Smart-Growth Policies

Ted Droettboom reported that Propositions 1-C and 84, approved by voters at the November general election, contained incentive monies which could be applied to *FOCUS* implementation, depending on trailer bills expected to go before the Legislature early in 2007.

Ken Kirkey outlined a proposal for county meetings early in the new year to introduce the 2007 FOCUS initiatives and clarify their relationship to Projections 2007, RHNA, anticipated incentives, and the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Action on the Proposed Amendments to Smart-Growth Policies was deferred to the next JPC meeting with a request that the policy on future urban development include a reference to urban limit lines/urban growth boundaries.

6.   Other Business

Two members of the Committee commented on the desirability of the JPC now becoming more proactive its approach, leading regional policy rather than reacting to the policy initiatives of others.

7.   Public Comment

All public comment was received relative to specific agenda items and is incorporated in the summary of those items.

8.   Adjournment

Association of Bay Area Governments
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
P.O. Box 2050
Oakland, CA 94607-4756
(510) 464-7942
fax: (510) 433-5542
tedd@abag.ca.gov
abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy/

Joint Policy Committee / Regional Planning Program

Date: January 9, 2006

To: Joint Policy Committee

From: Regional Planning Program Director

Subject: Proposed Amendments to Smart-Growth Policies

At its September meeting, I recommended that the JPC endorse amendments to the regional Smart-Growth Policies. These amendments were intended to reflect concerns and ideas that had risen in prominence since the regional agencies adopted those policies in 2002. Attachment A details the policy amendments proposed in September and their rationale.

The JPC did not approve my recommendations, but requested a report back clarifying the policy on Future Urban Development. Committee members also wished to consider new or enhanced policies related to school capacity and educational quality, sustainability (particularly green buildings), and affordable housing.

For the November JPC, I prepared a memo which addressed each of the issues identified in September. The Committee took no action on the recommendations in that memo as there was not a quorum present at that point in the meeting. In what follows, I am resubmitting the body of that memo for Committee Action. There is one change from the November memo: at the suggestion of one JPC member, I have added a reference to urban growth boundaries in the proposed policy on Land for Future Urban Development.

Land for Future Urban Development

Responding to the Committee's concern about the ambiguity of the previously suggested policy, I propose a more direct, albeit more negative, wording of the policy, incorporating elements of its rationale:

> Anticipate and prepare for future urban expansion by discouraging the premature subdivision of agricultural and vacant land for low-density residential development that cannot be efficiently served by transit, which does not provide for the complete range of infrastructure, uses and services required to meet the daily needs of residents, ~~and~~ which is located without regard to proximate employment opportunities *and which does not respect urban growth boundaries*. (Deletions from the November proposal are indicated ~~by strikeouts~~ and additions by *italics*)

School Capacity and Educational Quality

Concerns about school infrastructure and the quality of public education are frequently noted as impediments to the community acceptance and successful marketing of infill development. While the existing policies contain reference to educational facilities, there are opportunities to strengthen the links between smart growth and schools:

Amend the policy on Social Justice and Equity to read as follows:

> Improve conditions in disadvantaged neighborhoods, ensure environmental justice, and improve access to jobs, housing, ~~and~~ public services *and good schools* for all residents in the region. (In this and following amendment proposals, deletions from the September proposal are indicated by ~~strikeouts~~ and additions to the proposal by *italics*.)

Amend the policy on Infrastructure Investments to read as follows:

> Improve and maintain existing infrastructure and support future investments that promote smart growth, including water and land recycling, brownfield clean-up and re-use, multi-use ~~and school~~ facilities, smart building codes, retention of historic character and resources, and ~~educational improvements~~ *provision of high-quality school capacity*.

Amend the policy on Cooperation on Smart Growth Policies as follows:

> Encourage *the State*, local governments, *water and sewer districts, school districts,* stakeholders and other constituents in the Bay Area to cooperate in supporting actions consistent with the adopted Smart Growth policies. Forge cooperative relationships with governments and stakeholders in surrounding regions to support actions that will lead to inter-regional Smart Growth benefits. (In addition to school districts, I have added water and sewer districts as an explicitly named reference in this policy, as they—like school districts—have considerable influence over infrastructure capacity. I have also noted the significant omission of the State role in the policy as previously worded. The State has a significant say in virtually all public investments, including school facilities.)

Sustainability and Green Building

One of the principal reasons for smart growth is sustainability. Nevertheless, it may be helpful to include explicit references to sustainability and specific implementation measures, like green buildings, within the policies. Some direct reference to climate change is also timely.

Amend the policy on Environmental, Natural Resource, Open Space and Agricultural Preservation to read as follows:

> Protect and enhance open space, agricultural lands, other valued lands, watersheds and ecosystems throughout the region. Promote development patterns *and building technologies* that protect and improve air quality*, conserve resources and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.* Protect and enhance the San Francisco Bay and Estuary. *Protect scenic,*

historic, and cultural resources that contribute to the region's identity. (Also incorporates amendments on scenic, historic and cultural resources recommended in the September memo)

Amend the policy on Infrastructure Investments to read as follows:

Improve and maintain existing infrastructure and support future investments that promote smart growth, including water and land recycling, brownfield clean-up and re-use, multi-use facilities, smart building codes, *green building principles*, retention of historic character and resources, and provision of high-quality school capacity. (Incorporates earlier proposed school amendments without highlighting)

Affordable Housing

Housing affordability is a central tenet of the region's smart growth policies and of the *FOCUS* program. It is explicitly referenced in the first three smart-growth policies: Jobs/Housing Balance and Match, Housing and Displacement, and Social Justice and Equity. I cannot identify any additional references which would add value to the application of the policies.

RECOMMENDATION

I RECOMMEND:

A.   THAT the Joint Policy Committee endorse the addition of the following policies to the officially adopted *Smart Growth Preamble and Policies*:

Health and Safety
Promote and protect public health and safety by locating and designing development with sensitivity to natural and man-made risks, by reducing these risks where appropriate and feasible, and by facilitating healthy and safe behaviors.

Economic Activity and Goods Distribution
Encourage planning and development that respects the public and private infrastructure required for the maintenance of a prosperous regional economy and for the efficient provision and distribution of goods and services.

Future Urban Development
Anticipate and prepare for future urban expansion by discouraging the premature subdivision of agricultural and vacant land for low-density residential development which cannot be efficiently served by transit, which does not provide for the complete range of infrastructure, uses and services required to meet the daily needs of residents, which is located without regard to proximate employment opportunities, and which does not respect urban growth boundaries.

B.   THAT the Joint Policy Committee endorse amendments to existing smart growth policies to read as follows:

Social Justice and Equity
Improve conditions in disadvantaged neighborhoods, ensure environmental justice, and improve access to jobs, housing, public services and good schools for all residents in the region.

Environmental, Natural Resource, Open Space and Agricultural Preservation
Protect and enhance open space, agricultural lands, other valued lands, watersheds and ecosystems throughout the region. Promote development patterns and building technologies that protect and improve air quality, conserve resources and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Protect and enhance the San Francisco Bay and Estuary. Protect scenic, historic, and cultural resources that contribute to the region's identity.

Infrastructure Investments
Improve and maintain existing infrastructure and support future investments that promote smart growth, including water and land recycling, brownfield clean-up and re-use, multi-use facilities, smart building codes, green building principles, retention of historic character and resources, and provision of high-quality school capacity.

Cooperation on Smart Growth Policies
Encourage the State, local governments, water and sewer districts, school districts, stakeholders and other constituents in the Bay Area to cooperate in supporting actions consistent with the adopted Smart Growth policies. Forge cooperative relationships with governments and stakeholders in surrounding regions to support actions that will lead to inter-regional Smart Growth benefits.

C. THAT the Joint Policy Committee recommend and refer the above additional policies and policy amendments (as consolidated in Attachment B) to the Association of Bay Area Governments Executive Board, to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Board, to the Bay Conservation and Development Commission, and to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for formal adoption as regional policy.

Attachment A

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SMART-GROWTH POLICIES, *SEPTEMBER 2006*

The criteria for PDA and PCA identification are constructed as goals and strategies. Each strategy has associated with it one or more geographic data layers, which when combined via our spatial model point to potential Priority Areas.

Attachment A.1) lists the goals and strategies we are using for *Focusing Our Vision*. Most of these are based on adopted regional policy as expressed in the *Smart Growth Preamble and Policies* (Attachment A.2). This official expression of regional policy was adopted by four of the five Bay Area regional agencies (ABAG, BAAQMD, BCDC, and MTC) in 2002 upon the completion of the *Smart Growth Strategy / Regional Livability Footprint Project* (the *Project*).

However, a few goals and strategies do not have clear referents in adopted policy. These new goals and strategies reflect issues and concerns that have risen in prominence since 2002. The areas of potentially expanded regional policy are italicized in Attachment A.1.

Regional and local collaboration around specific Priority Areas will benefit from regional policy that has been officially sanctioned by elected policy-makers. Therefore, we are recommending that the *Smart Growth Preamble and Policies* be formally amended to incorporate policy intent relevant to these emergent issues and concerns.

We believe new policy is required on the following topics:

1.   Health and Safety

Last year the California Air Resource Board (CARB) released its *Air Quality and Land-Use Handbook* and the JPC received a presentation from CARB staff. The *Handbook's* recommendations are consistent with concerns that have also been highlighted by the environmental-justice community and are the subject of BAAQMD's Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) program. All suggest that development needs to be carefully sited relative to local sources of air pollution, including highways and ports. The 100th anniversary of the San Francisco earthquake, increased worries about the stability of the region's levees, and the prospect of sea-level rise as the result of global warming have also reminded us that we live in region with significant environmental risks. To the extent, possible, we need to heed these risks when locating new development and population concentrations. The potential impact of development form on physical exercise and the onset of obesity also deserves some recognition.

Proposed Policy:

Health and Safety
Promote and protect public health and safety by locating and designing development with sensitivity to natural and man-made risks, by reducing these risks where appropriate and feasible, and by facilitating healthy and safe behaviors.

2.   Economic Activity and Goods Distribution

The *Smart Growth Strategy / Regional Livability Footprint Project* was started at a time when the Bay Area economy was booming, and it is likely that the impact of the dot-com bust had not fully sunk in when the *Project* wound down in 2002. For whatever reason, economic development issues do not enjoy high standing in either the *Project*'s final report or in the *Preamble and Policies*. Since 2002, the region's goods movement study and some local planning exercises have pointed to potential land-use competition between "smart" residential development and goods-distribution facilities. Our transit-oriented development work has also highlighted possible conflicts between proposed residential densities and established industrial activities; and there has been a general concern about residential development foreclosing opportunities for job generators. A policy sensitive to these economic concerns is appropriate.

Proposed Policy:

> **Economic Activity and Goods Distribution**
> Encourage planning and development that respects the public and private infrastructure required for the maintenance of a prosperous regional economy and for the efficient provision and distribution of goods and services.

3.   Land for Future Urban Development

The *Project* and the resultant *Policies* emphasize infill development and re-development within existing cities and towns. This is appropriate and desirable. However, even with copious infill, future regional growth will likely require some totally new communities developed on greenfield. Planning these new communities to conserve natural resources, to reduce trip demand through mixed and multiple uses, and to achieve densities appropriate to transit service will be more difficult if the greenfield is prematurely subdivided and developed at low densities (so-called parcelization). It is the region's interest to maintain a relatively un-subdivided and undeveloped "urban reserve" to facilitate the planning and development of new compact and complete communities in the future.

Proposed Policy:

> **Future Urban Development**
> Reserve land for the future creation and extension of complete communities developed at efficient urban densities, encompassing a range of uses and services required to meet the daily needs of residents and providing proximate employment opportunities as appropriate.

4.   Conservation of aesthetic, historic and cultural resources

As the Bay Area matures, there is an increasing interest in protecting unique aspects of its cultural heritage in addition to its natural environment. Amending the policy relating

to environmental conservation makes it clear that we may consider culturally significant resources in designating priority areas.

Proposed Policy Amendment:

> Amend the policy on Environmental, Natural Resource, Open Space and Agricultural Preservation to add the following sentence at the end:
>
> > Protect scenic, historic, and cultural resources that contribute to the region's identity.

August 2006

Goals to Advance the Regional Vision

- Strengthen and support unique existing communities
- Create compact, healthy communities with a diversity of housing, jobs, activities, and services to meet the daily needs of residents
- Increase housing supply and choices
- Improve housing affordability
- Increase transportation efficiency and choices
- Protect and steward natural habitat, open space, and agricultural land
- Improve social and economic equity
- Promote economic and fiscal health
- Conserve resources, promote sustainability, and improve environmental quality
- *Protect public health and safety*

Priority Development Area Strategies

- Encourage infill and the efficient use of land capacity within existing communities
- Provide for compact, complete, resource-efficient communities near existing or planned transit and other infrastructure
- Provide opportunities for people to live near their jobs and work near their homes
- Encourage a mix of land uses with jobs, housing, retail, schools, parks, recreation, and services in proximity
- Locate development in areas served and likely to be served by frequent passenger rail, bus, and/or ferry service
- Support community revitalization without displacing current residents
- Ensure that all socio-economic groups benefit from regional change
- Use existing infrastructure capacity and maximize return on new infrastructure investments
- *Maintain goods movement corridors and retain land uses that support related distribution and industrial uses*
- *Direct development so as to promote and protect public health and safety, avoid hazards, and/or mitigate development impacts*
- Reduce the number and length of auto trips and facilitate walking and biking
- *Reserve land to accommodate future growth at appropriate densities*

Priority Conservation Area Strategies

- Maintain the productive function of lands for agriculture and other resource needs
- Protect and restore wildlife corridors and habitat
- Preserve the natural flow and recharge of water and support ecosystem processes
- *Protect scenic, historic, and cultural resources that contribute to the region's identity*
- Protect and enhance significant open space and recreation areas and networks

Note: Goals and strategies are listed in no particular order and are not ranked. Italicized items do not have referents in existing official regional policy.

SMART-GROWTH PREAMBLE AND POLICIES

Preamble

Current land-use patterns in the San Francisco Bay Area are putting intense pressure on the economic, environmental and social wellbeing of the Bay Area and of surrounding regions. The projected addition of over one million new residents and one million new jobs in the coming decades will further challenge our ability to sustain the high quality of life we enjoy today.

To help meet this challenge, the five regional agencies of the Bay Region—the Association of Bay Area Governments, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Bay Conservation and Development Commission, Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Regional Water Quality Control Board—along with the economy, environment and social equity caucuses of the Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities, developed a set of Smart Growth policies.

The policies reflect the values articulated by workshop participants of the Smart Growth Strategy/Regional Livability Footprint Project and address Bay Area conditions. The policies are consistent with widely accepted notions of smart growth. They are meant to encourage meaningful participation from local governments, stakeholders and residents.

The policies provide a framework for decision-making on development patterns, housing, transportation, environment, infrastructure, governmental fiscal health and social equity that can lead us toward development of vibrant neighborhoods, preservation of open space, clean air and water, and enhanced mobility choices, while enhancing the Bay Area's relationship with surrounding regions.

Policies

Jobs/Housing Balance and Match
Improve the jobs/housing linkages through the development of housing in proximity to jobs, and both in proximity to public transportation. Increase the supply of affordable housing and support efforts to match job income and housing affordability levels.

Housing and Displacement
Improve existing housing and develop sufficient new housing to provide for the housing needs of the Bay Area community. Support efforts to improve housing affordability and limit the displacement of existing residents and businesses.

Social Justice and Equity
Improve conditions in disadvantaged neighborhoods, ensure environmental justice, and improve access to jobs, housing, public services and good schools for all residents in the region.

Environmental, Natural Resource, Open Space and Agricultural Preservation
Protect and enhance open space, agricultural lands, other valued lands, watersheds and ecosystems throughout the region. Promote development patterns that protect and improve air quality. Protect and enhance the San Francisco Bay and Estuary.

Mobility, Livability and Transit Support
Enhance community livability by promoting infill, transit oriented and walkable communities, and compact development as appropriate. Develop multi-family housing, mixed-use development, and alternative transportation to improve opportunities for all members of the community.

Local and Regional Transportation Efficiencies
Promote opportunities for transit use and alternative modes of transportation including improved rail, bus, high occupancy (HOV) systems, and ferry services as well as enhanced walking and biking. Increase connectivity between and strengthen alternative modes of transportation, including improved rail, bus, ride share and ferry services as well as walking and biking. Promote investments that adequately maintain the existing transportation system and improve the efficiency of transportation infrastructure.

Infrastructure Investments
Improve and maintain existing infrastructure and support future investments that promote smart growth, including water and land recycling, brownfield clean-up and re-use, multi-use and school facilities, smart building codes, retention of historic character and resources, and educational improvements.

Local Government Fiscal Health
Improve the fiscal health of local government by promoting stable and secure revenue sources, reduced service provision costs through smart growth targeted infrastructure improvement, and state and regional sponsored fiscal incentives. Support cooperative efforts among local jurisdictions to address housing and commercial development, infrastructure costs, and provision of services.

Cooperation on Smart Growth Policies
Encourage local governments, stakeholders and other constituents in the Bay Area to cooperate in supporting actions consistent with the adopted Smart Growth policies. Forge cooperative relationships with governments and stakeholders in surrounding regions to support actions that will lead to inter-regional Smart Growth benefits.

SMART-GROWTH PREAMBLE AND POLICIES *(AS AMENDED)*

Preamble

Current land-use patterns in the San Francisco Bay Area are putting intense pressure on the economic, environmental and social wellbeing of the Bay Area and of surrounding regions. The projected addition of over one million new residents and one million new jobs in the coming decades will further challenge our ability to sustain the high quality of life we enjoy today.

To help meet this challenge, the five regional agencies of the Bay Region—the Association of Bay Area Governments, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Bay Conservation and Development Commission, Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Regional Water Quality Control Board—along with the economy, environment and social equity caucuses of the Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities, developed a set of Smart Growth policies.

The policies reflect the values articulated by workshop participants of the Smart Growth Strategy/Regional Livability Footprint Project and address Bay Area conditions. The policies are consistent with widely accepted notions of smart growth. They are meant to encourage meaningful participation from local governments, stakeholders and residents.

The policies provide a framework for decision-making on development patterns, housing, transportation, environment, infrastructure, governmental fiscal health and social equity that can lead us toward development of vibrant neighborhoods, preservation of open space, clean air and water, and enhanced mobility choices, while enhancing the Bay Area's relationship with surrounding regions.

Policies

Jobs/Housing Balance and Match
Improve the jobs/housing linkages through the development of housing in proximity to jobs, and both in proximity to public transportation. Increase the supply of affordable housing and support efforts to match job income and housing affordability levels.

Housing and Displacement
Improve existing housing and develop sufficient new housing to provide for the housing needs of the Bay Area community. Support efforts to improve housing affordability and limit the displacement of existing residents and businesses.

Social Justice and Equity
Improve conditions in disadvantaged neighborhoods, ensure environmental justice, and improve access to jobs, housing, public services and good schools for all residents in the region.

Health and Safety
Promote and protect public health and safety by locating and designing development with sensitivity to natural and man-made risks, by reducing these risks where appropriate and feasible, and by facilitating healthy and safe behaviors.

Environmental, Natural Resource, Open Space and Agricultural Preservation
Protect and enhance open space, agricultural lands, other valued lands, watersheds and ecosystems throughout the region. Promote development patterns and building technologies that protect and improve air quality, conserve resources and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Protect and enhance the San Francisco Bay and Estuary. Protect scenic, historic, and cultural resources that contribute to the region's identity.

Future Urban Development
Anticipate and prepare for future urban expansion by discouraging the premature subdivision of agricultural and vacant land for low-density residential development that cannot be efficiently served by transit, which does not provide for the complete range of infrastructure, uses and services required to meet the daily needs of residents and which is located without regard to proximate employment opportunities.

Economic Activity and Goods Distribution
Encourage planning and development that respects the public and private infrastructure required for the maintenance of a prosperous regional economy and for the efficient provision and distribution of goods and services.

Mobility, Livability and Transit Support
Enhance community livability by promoting infill, transit oriented and walkable communities, and compact development as appropriate. Develop multi-family housing, mixed-use development, and alternative transportation to improve opportunities for all members of the community.

Local and Regional Transportation Efficiencies
Promote opportunities for transit use and alternative modes of transportation including improved rail, bus, high occupancy (HOV) systems, and ferry services as well as enhanced walking and biking. Increase connectivity between and strengthen alternative modes of transportation, including improved rail, bus, ride share and ferry services as well as walking and biking. Promote investments that adequately maintain the existing transportation system and improve the efficiency of transportation infrastructure.

Infrastructure Investments
Improve and maintain existing infrastructure and support future investments that promote smart growth, including water and land recycling, brownfield clean-up and re-use, multi-use facilities, smart building codes, green building principles, retention of historic character and resources, and provision of high-quality school capacity.

Local Government Fiscal Health
Improve the fiscal health of local government by promoting stable and secure revenue sources, reduced service provision costs through smart growth targeted infrastructure improvement, and state and regional sponsored fiscal incentives. Support cooperative efforts among local jurisdictions to address housing and commercial development, infrastructure costs, and provision of services.

Cooperation on Smart Growth Policies
Encourage the State, local governments, water and sewer districts, school districts, stakeholders and other constituents in the Bay Area to cooperate in supporting actions consistent with the adopted Smart Growth policies. Forge cooperative relationships with governments and stakeholders in surrounding regions to support actions that will lead to inter-regional Smart Growth benefits.

Association of Bay Area Governments
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Joseph P. Bort MetroCen-
ter
101 Eighth Street
P.O. Box 2050
Oakland, CA 94607-4756
(510) 464-7942
fax: (510) 433-5542
tedd@abag.ca.gov
abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy/

Joint Policy Committee/Regional Planning Program

Date: January 9, 2006

To: Joint Policy Committee

From: Regional Planning Program Director

Subject: San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Participation on
               the Joint Policy Committee

The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) has formally re-
quested membership in the Joint Policy Committee. A letter from BCDC's Executive Director
reporting a unanimous Commission decision to that effect is attached.

Full BCDC membership on the JPC, including voting privileges, will require a change in state
legislation. Incorporating BCDC into the Committee will likely also require some reconsidera-
tion of the JPC's total size and the number of representatives from each member agency. There
are currently two vacancies on the JPC as the result of members resigning their appointments to
the ABAG Executive Board and the Air District Board. An MTC vacancy is expected in Febru-
ary.

It is appropriate to consider this matter at the March JPC, after the membership of the JPC's ex-
isting constituent Boards and Commission has been stabilized and before replacement members
are appointed to the JPC. In the interim, the JPC has invited BCDC to participate in the Commit-
tee's consideration of climate change.

I RECOMMEND:

   A. THAT staff report back in March on options for reconfiguring the JPC's size and compo-
      sition and on a legislative proposal to incorporate BCDC as a full voting member should
      that be the Committee's desire;

   B. THAT the JPC request its existing member agencies to withhold the appointment of re-
      placement Committee members until the issue of JPC composition and size is resolved.

December 7, 2006

Mark Ross, Chair
Joint Policy Committee
MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4756

ATTENTION: Ted Droettboom

Dear Mr. Ross:

I am pleased to inform you that our Commission unanimously decided today to request that BCDC be invited to participate as a member of the Joint Policy Committee. Our Commissioners concluded that BCDC's participation on the JPC would advance a number of objectives in BCDC's strategic plan, which call for greater collaboration with other regional agencies to address critical issues such as climate change, regional sustainability, transportation, air quality and natural resource protection.

We recognize that BCDC's participation may initially present some organizational difficulties in that the current membership of the JPC is established by State law. Because we believe the Joint Policy Committee provides a critical forum at which BCDC and the other agencies can gain a better understanding of each other's work and can foster the development of consistent policy on regional issues, we are open to participating in whatever manner the JPC feels would be most effective.

Please let me know how we can most constructively proceed on this matter.

Sincerely,

WILL TRAVIS
Executive Director

Association of Bay Area Governments
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Joseph P. Bort MetroCen-
ter
101 Eighth Street
P.O. Box 2050
Oakland, CA 94607-4756
(510) 464-7942
fax: (510) 433-5542
tedd@abag.ca.gov
abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy/

Joint Policy Committee/Regional Planning Program

Date: January 11, 2006

To: Joint Policy Committee

From: Regional Planning Program Director

Subject: 2007 *FOCUS* Program

In the Spring of 2006, the Bay Area, with the assistance of a state grant, commenced a multi-agency regional planning program called *Focusing Our Vision*, now more easily referred to simply as *FOCUS*. *FOCUS* builds upon a rich legacy of recent Bay Area regional planning efforts, in particular:

- *The Smart Growth Strategy / Regional Livability Footprint Project* and its "Network of Neighborhoods" regional vision;

- *The Smart Growth Preamble and Policies* adopted jointly by four regional agencies in 2002;

- The Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) and Housing Incentive Program (HIP) initiatives;

- The smart-growth-policy-based *Projections 2003, 2005, and 2007;*

- The Transportation and Land-Use Platform in the 2005 Regional Transportation Plan, *Transportation 2030*;

- The Resolution 3434 Transit-Oriented Development Policy.

However, *FOCUS* recognizes that none of these efforts, either individually or collectively, is complete and perfect; that regional planning is a continuous learning process subject to constant refinement and improvement. As well, even the best plans are only as good as their implementation.

The principal improvement which *FOCUS* seeks at this time is greater buy-in among local governments. Local governments, through land-use planning and development controls, are the main determinants of how the Bay Area grows. Yet too many of those powerful entities feel (rightly or wrongly) excluded from the regional planning process and uncommitted to a collective vision for the Bay Area. By building a series of voluntary compacts relative to mutually agreed Priority Areas—and by demonstrating success in realizing the potential of these areas through both regional and local efforts—*FOCUS* hopes over time to help remove the walls which currently separate regional and local objectives.

While *FOCUS* is still not even a year old, the beginning of a new calendar year is an appropriate time to generally assess learning so far and to plot out next steps. This memo and the ensuing JPC discussion are intended to contribute to those purposes.

The Limitations of Regional-Level Mapping

With a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), composed of local-government professionals from all nine counties, regional staff has spent much of the initial *FOCUS* effort on developing, testing and implementing a regional mapping model for identifying potential Priority Area locations. Regional staff has assembled information from a variety of sources and constructed about four dozen individually mapped data layers for the entire region. Staff has also devised a graphic methodology for weighting data layers and interactively combining them in order to explore a variety of alternative value scenarios. The JPC was introduced to this technical capability at its September meeting.

Staff and the TAC have used the new mapping facility to mix, match, meld, and blend (as well as slice, dice and puree) complex data in a variety of ways to see what they revealed about the most appropriate areas to prioritize for regional development support. A comparable effort is underway with an open-space coalition, GreenVision, to identify potential priority areas for conservation. However, this effort is evolving at a different pace and is not yet ready to report conclusions.

The interactive mapping effort has resulted in some revealing, colorful and graphically stunning maps—each accompanied by detailed, but largely invisible, data tabulations. We have learned a great deal about the region; and the mapping/modeling capacity, including the underlying detailed data layers, will be immensely valuable as we move forward on *FOCUS* and other regional planning efforts.

However, we also discovered that it is possible to have too much information come into play at one time. Some of our more complex data models served more to confuse, obfuscate and confound than to illuminate. Too many layers combined with complex weighting schemes tended to separate us from the key policy variables that really mattered from a regional perspective.

Therefore, with the Technical Advisory Committee, we decided to concentrate on a simple map which was based solely on the most important regional policy considerations. The resultant map, which will be before the JPC at its January meeting, identifies potential priority locations which are (1) within existing communities; (2) near fixed transit; and (3) within areas where jobs exceed employed residents. Not only are these three key policy considerations powerful within their own right, they are also highly correlated with other lesser regional concerns, so they can represent complexity without adding complexity.

The final map does not represent potential priority-area boundaries, nor does it identify potential or desirable development intensities. It only provides "signposts" or clues to where priority areas might be. The map is purposely composed of uniform dots, rather than real geographic areas, to signal its imprecision   It is our intention to define more precise boundaries and desired

development intensities directly with willing local government partners. We propose that no priority area be designated without agreement from the affected local government.

An Open Process

When we look at the final potential priority area map in detail, it also becomes readily apparent that it can only take us so far, and maybe not far enough. The three key policy considerations point to some obvious—and some not so obvious—places to locate priority development. However, we can readily notice that a more nuanced interpretation of regional policy would take us to a few more areas. We are also acutely conscious of the fact that we may not be aware of other local factors that could make some presently un-demarcated areas candidates for priority status, particularly with the appropriate investments.

We, therefore, propose that there be an open process allowing any local government to submit areas for priority-area consideration provided that these areas meet three basic entry criteria: that they be

1. Within an existing community;
2. Near existing or planned fixed transit (or served by comparably capacious bus service);
3. Planned (or planning) for more housing.

After entry, areas may be further priority-ranked by other criteria, including:

- The presence of multiple or mixed-uses contributing to a complete community;
- The presence of job concentrations, providing proximate employment;
- Circulation and connectivity.

Rather than impose standards top-down, we propose to refine all these criteria and their precise application in consultation with local governments over the next several weeks.

We also propose to discuss a possible hierarchy of priority "place types" with local governments, recognizing that not every place can be or wants to be like downtown San Francisco, but nevertheless could be a deserving priority for regional support. In addition, we would propose to differentiate areas based on their level of planning readiness. Those with plans and/or developments in place would be designated as Priority Areas; those requiring new or additional planning would be classified as Potential Priority Areas.

Once designated as a regional priority, an area would be eligible to apply and compete for regional incentives, as outlined in a companion memo to this one. Priority Areas would be eligible for capital funding. Potential Priority Areas could apply for planning funds.

2007 Milestones

To pursue the ideas and process outlined above, we propose a 2007 *FOCUS* program built around the following key milestones.

Mid-February through Mid-March	Outreach meetings to local elected officials and senior appointed officials in all nine counties to explain *FOCUS;* its relationship to other important regional programs, including RHNA, *Projections*, and the RTP; and the emergent opportunities for incentives
March-June	Meetings with individual local governments to explore priority development opportunities and parameters within their jurisdictions (Jurisdictions will be self-identified through the open process or solicited for participation because of their identification and ranking on the potential priority location map.)
April 19th	ABAG General Assembly to summarize conclusions reached through the earlier consultations, to explore the ways in which additional support can be provided (particularly from new state programs) and to kick off the formal application process for Priority Area or Potential Priority Area status
June 29th	Deadline for initial round of applications
July-August	Meetings between regional staff and applying local governments to clarify individual priority area parameters
September	Round of county-level meetings to vet priority areas and potential priority areas with public and stakeholders
October 18th	ABAG General Assembly to adopt initial set of priority areas as part of regional growth strategy based on *FOCUS*
After adoption	Applications for planning and capital incentives.

Parallel to this progression of milestones, staff will work internally and with the state to pin down a program of incentives and an application process for those incentives.

This program is, of course, subject to modification as we meet with local governments and incorporate their ideas and concerns and as the state clarifies its intentions.

Recommendation

I RECOMMEND:

THAT the JPC endorse the process and general program as outlined in this memo as the basis for *FOCUS* activities in 2007.

Joseph P. Bort MetroCen-
ter
101 Eighth Street
P.O. Box 2050
Oakland, CA 94607-4756
(510) 464-7942
fax: (510) 433-5542
tedd@abag.ca.gov
abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy/

Association of Bay Area Governments
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Joint Policy Committee/Regional Planning Program

Date: January 10, 2006

To: Joint Policy Committee

From: Regional Planning Program Director

Subject: *FOCUS* Incentives: Legislation and Regional Transportation Plan

---

This memo details two emergent sources of funds to assist in the implementation of *FOCUS* priority development objectives. There are heavy competing demands on both sources and neither is assured. Securing an opportunity to direct a portion of potential fund expenditures will require the very active consideration and involvement of the JPC and its member agencies.

State Bond Monies

As the Committee is aware, at the November General Election, the voters approved a number of state bond propositions. Included within these propositions are accounts which could be used to support the kind of smart growth (i.e., infill and transit-oriented development) that the Bay Area has been seeking through the *FOCUS* program. This table details the most likely sources of state incentive funds.

Source	Account	State	Region (est.)
Prop 1C	Regional Planning, Housing and Infill Incentives	$850M	$141.4M
Prop 1C	Transit-oriented Development	$300M	NA
Prop 1C	Housing-related Parks	$200M	$33.3M
Prop 84	Urban Greening	$90M	$15.0M
Prop 84	Urban Forestry	$20M	$3.3M
Prop 84	Local and Regional Parks	$400M	$66.5M
Prop 84	Planning Grants and Loans	$90M	$15.0M
	TOTAL	**$1950M**	**$274.5M**

The fourth column is a hypothetical estimate of the Bay Area's possible share based on a combination of existing population and projected growth. What we actually get could be much less or much more depending on legislation and the allocation methods actually used by the state. All but the $300 million transit-oriented development account are fully or partially subject to trailer bills to come before the Legislature this session. At this point it is not assured that the region

will have any say at all in how these monies are allocated or spent.   Transit-oriented development monies are subject to an existing legislated program administered by the Department of Housing and Community Development.

Legislative advocacy will be required to ensure that the Bay Area's interests are represented in the trailer bills. To guide that advocacy, staff has prepared a set of principles for the Committee's consideration and endorsement:

Making the Most of Limited Dollars
Principles for Distributing Proposition 1C and Proposition 84 Incentives

1. Create an integrated program
Propositions 1C and 84 establish a number of accounts to support sustainable communities, transit-oriented development, and infill housing. These are closely related, mutually supportive concepts, and they should be treated as such. The accounts should be administered jointly through a single integrated program to maximize synergy.

2. Respect priorities established by regions
California is a state of regions. All of the largest regions have undertaken major regional planning efforts. These efforts, characterized by the State as "regional blueprints," share a common direction: all emphasize compact, infill development aimed at supporting and revitalizing existing communities, maximizing transportation efficiency, and conserving land resources. There are also sometimes subtle, but nonetheless important, differences among regions and among regional plans. There should be a clear and direct connection between the priorities established by these significant regional planning exercises and the distribution of state incentives.

3. Reward inclusive and collaborative planning
All the "regional blueprint" plans have been developed through inclusive and collaborative planning processes involving communities and stakeholders. The best local plans are also produced through participatory processes that give all affected parties ownership of the results. The development which the state is encouraging through incentives is more likely to happen and to be embraced as a positive outcome if is planned through processes that are genuinely collaborative and inclusive of all relevant interests.

4. Make big differences
In total, Propositions 1C and 84 provide nearly $2 billion in incentives. This can make a big difference or almost no difference at all, depending on how it is distributed. If it is spread too evenly and too thinly it will result in change only at the margins. The money needs to be strategically packaged and distributed so as to assist significant plans and projects achieve their tipping points. We need to aim for noticeable successes.

5. Set examples
Noticeable successes should be replicable. With limited funds, it will not be possible to support all good projects. Incentives should be directed first at potential trendsetters. State funds can help to reduce the impediments and risks for those first out of gate, but may not be as necessary for those who are able to learn from these early successes. To the extent possible, funds should

be distributed to maximize learning potential for subsequent plans and projects for which incentives may be more limited.

6. Achieve real results
Projects and plans should be evaluated on the basis of short-term, on-the-ground results, such as actual infill housing units added to existing communities. Theoretical concepts, like vehicle miles traveled (VMT), do not provide sufficient accountability, as they are not directly observable and can only be assessed through assumption-laden mathematical models, which may or may not be accurate.

Regional Transportation Plan

The region, including the JPC, will soon begin the process of preparing the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Proposition 1-C and Proposition 84 infill incentives are enumerated in millions of dollars; expenditures in the RTP are enumerated in billions.

Over the last couple of RTPs, the region has initiated the idea of using transportation funds to provide incentives for smart, transportation-efficient development: first with the TLC and HIP programs and more recently with the Resolution 3434 Transit-Oriented Development Policy.

The impending RTP and the infusion of some new funds from federal, state and regional sources provide an opportunity to assess whether additional monies can be directed to encourage and support region-serving development, noting that some local jurisdictions have indicated that their support of more intense housing is contingent on securing additional transportation capital to service that development. The climate-change imperative may also have a larger future role to play in where transportation dollars go.

The TOD policy has established the precedent of employing transportation expansion capital to encourage complementary and supportive development. At least two policy issues require the JPC's consideration as we begin the next RTP: (1) to what extent can the region's transportation expansion plans be even more closely linked to its development objectives; (2) is it appropriate to begin linking a portion of the plan's maintenance expenditures (approximately 80 percent of plan dollars) to the achievement of smart-growth and housing priorities as well. Consideration of these questions is consistent with the JPC's desire to take a more proactive role in the development of regional policy.

Recommendations

I RECOMMEND:

A. THAT the JPC endorse the "Principles for Distributing Proposition 1C and 84 Incentives" as the basis for legislative advocacy relative to impending trailer bills;

B. THAT as part of the forthcoming preparation of the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan, the JPC begin an active consideration of directing additional transportation money to support regional development priorities.

Association of Bay Area Governments
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
P.O. Box 2050
Oakland, CA 94607-4756
(510) 464-7942
fax: (510) 433-5542
tedd@abag.ca.gov
abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy/

Joint Policy Committee/Regional Planning Program

Date: January 10, 2006

To: Joint Policy Committee

From: Regional Planning Program Director

Subject: JPC Climate Change Study

At its meeting of November 17th, 2006, the Joint Policy Committee (JPC) accepted a request from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to study the issue of climate change and recommend a set of appropriate actions for regional agencies to take on the issue. The JPC also approved a set of initial study parameters to guide its work. Foremost among these is a commitment to have a final report completed in May.

This memo introduces some initial work which regional staff has been taking on the JPC's behalf. This work is presented for information and discussion. No Committee action is required at this time.

Public Workshop

The parameters for the JPC climate change study include a public and stakeholder workshop early in 2007 to solicit and discuss suggestions for appropriate regional action. This workshop has now been scheduled as follows:

February 16, 2007
9:00 A.M. to Noon
MetroCenter Auditorium
101 Eighth Street, Oakland

The workshop will be announced via news release and advertised on agency websites. Relevant stakeholder groups and other interested and expert parties will be individually invited to attend. This will not be a formal meeting of the JPC, and JPC member attendance is optional. However, members of the JPC and of other regional committees, councils and boards are encouraged to participate, either actively or as observers. The workshop proceedings will be reported to the JPC in March.

Transportation Measures

Fifty percent of Bay Area greenhouse gas emissions are attributable to transportation sources. Chris Briddle, former MTC planning director, and Bruce Riordan, consultant to MTC and the Air District, have been doing some initial exploration of possible initiatives which the region

could take to reduce emissions from transportation sources. Mr. Riordan will present their preliminary findings at the January 19th JPC meeting.

Elements of a Regional Strategy

As part of its Climate Summit on November 10th, the Air District convened breakout sessions to share initial ideas for addressing climate change in the Bay Area. Participants self-selected into four groups: business, government, non-governmental organizations, and transportation, and they suggested a panoply of interesting and useful ideas. Staff has reviewed the suggestions made during all four sessions and grouped them into general themes, reported below. These may constitute the rudimentary elements of a regional strategy, but are presented only for information and discussion at this time.

Many of the suggestions made at the Summit are not directed at, or appropriate to, regional agencies. Participants were not asked to identify only regional actions. Some suggestions conflict with other suggestions. This is to be expected at the beginning of a process. A few suggestions seem to be derived from a general environmental ethic and may only be tangentially related to climate change.

In general, expectations for regional action are surprisingly modest. This may be an implicit recognition of the limited powers accorded the region. More worrisome: it may be indicative of our collective incapacity to fully appreciate the magnitude of the climate-change issue or the ambitiousness of the state climate-change targets. There seems to be tendency to recommend what we are already doing—just more of it. While not exactly "business as usual," this continuing marginal improvement approach, even if accelerated, may be inadequate to the very big challenges ahead. Smart growth, for example, will help in the long term but is unlikely to produce enough change soon enough to make a significant difference relative to the state's 2020 target. More fundamental alterations in what we do and how we do it may be required.

Principal themes, without regard to organizational or institutional responsibility and without any attempt to evaluate or rank, are as follows:

- Transportation and land-use: planning and investment
  Including, for example:
    o Encouraging more smart-growth (infill, TOD, jobs/housing balance, centered development);
    o Discouraging development and transportation investments in areas subject to sea-level rise;
    o Connecting transportation funding directly to smart-growth initiatives;
    o Encouraging energy conserving housing developments and buildings;
    o Encouraging more office development in transit-accessible locations;
    o Locating context-setting and highly symbolic public facilities (e.g., sports stadiums) with greater regard to multi-modal accessibility;
    o Developing stronger public transit, biking and walking systems;
    o Providing more free shuttles, particularly in downtown areas;
    o Expanding carpool lanes;

- o Giving greater priority to non-automobile modes in the regional transportation plan;
- o Implementing "complete streets" supporting all travel modes;
- o Canceling highway widening projects;
- o Developing a regional rail plan;
- o Supporting inter-regional high-speed rail;
- o Integrating rail and bus networks;
- o Encouraging safe routes to schools;
- o Increasing car share availability;
- o Expanding bus rapid transit;
- o Encouraging more transportation demand management (TDM) including tele-commuting and employer trip reduction ordinances;
- o Facilitating more ride sharing.

- Information sharing, networking, and technical assistance
  Including, for example:
  - o Maintaining and publishing an inventory or clearinghouse of contacts, relevant information, current initiatives and best practices;
  - o Holding forums to share information and provide opportunities for peer-to-peer networking on climate-change issues;
  - o Providing metrics and models to assess climate-change effects and initiatives;
  - o Developing a greenhouse-gas-reduction toolkit;
  - o Providing regional indicators of climate progress;
  - o Funding itinerate experts to assist greenhouse-gas reduction programs;
  - o Automating access to utility baseline data;
  - o Standardizing and streamlining emissions inventory and audit processes;
  - o Providing information to assist environmentally friendly procurement;
  - o Joining national networks of cities and regions working on climate change initiatives.

- Alternative technologies, energy sources, and fuels
  Including, for example:
  - o Exploring "community choice aggregation" utility models;
  - o Supporting renewable energy;
  - o Encouraging plug-in hybrids and other fuel-efficient vehicles;
  - o Accelerating implementation of cleaner fuels (e.g., biodiesel)
  - o Using landfill methane to power trucks and buses;
  - o Supporting AB 1493 (Pavley) type rules for freight vehicles;
  - o Electrifying CalTrain;
  - o Cleaning school bus emissions.

- Financial incentives and disincentives
  Including, for example:
  - o Exploring new vehicle fees and taxes (e.g., vehicle registration fee to be used for climate-friendly transportation);
  - o Removing parking subsidies;

- o   Implementing a "feebate" program (rebates for fuel efficient vehicles supported by fees on less efficient vehicles);
- o   Implementing an indirect-source development fee, similar to that being tried in the San Joaquin air basin, to pay for transportation improvements;
- o   Raising parking meter rates and using the funding generated for climate protection;
- o   Providing additional incentives for fleet turnover;
- o   Pursuing environmentally preferable purchasing and contracting programs;
- o   Developing a community-based system for trading energy or carbon credits;
- o   Providing regional funding for local, NGO and small-business greenhouse-gas-reduction programs and projects;
- o   Exploring new pricing strategies (e.g., road tolls, reduced transit fares).

- Regulation
  Including, for example:
  - o   Increasing standards for stationary sources;
  - o   Requiring taxi fleets to phase in hybrid or other fuel-efficient vehicles;
  - o   Implementing energy efficient standards for building remodeling;
  - o   Setting regional green building standards so investors cannot choose jurisdictions with less stringent regulations;
  - o   Preventing refinery flaring;
  - o   Ending exemptions for trucks;
  - o   Expediting permit processes for green development;
  - o   Removing methane exemptions.

- Integration (incorporating climate considerations into existing programs and procedures)
  Including, for example:
  - o   Making greenhouse-gas impact an important part of the CEQA process;
  - o   Tying MTC project funding to emissions impact;
  - o   Basing Proposition 1B funding on support for emission reduction.

- Public information
  Including, for example:
  - o   Communicating the benefits of reduced or zero car ownership;
  - o   Connecting "Spare the Air Days" to the climate issue;
  - o   Designing and implementing a school curriculum;
  - o   Coordinating town hall meetings;
  - o   "Branding" climate change and creating a recognizable logo, similar to "Spare the Air;"
  - o   Publishing a climate change newsletter;
  - o   Exploiting community-access, public and commercial television opportunities;
  - o   Engaging youth in climate change and emission issues;
  - o   Implementing environmental considerations in new driver education programs;
  - o   Providing a forum for businesses and other affected entities to express opinions on climate- change policies and regulations;
  - o   Providing rebate and incentive information;

- o Providing resources for community and employee education;
- o Providing information on how other environmental issues relate to climate change;
- o Educating parents on how their children may be affected by climate change;
- o Connecting builders and developers to the climate issue;
- o Involving churches;
- o Emphasizing personal responsibility and things individuals can do to reduce emissions;
- o Tailoring messages to reach the not-yet-converted;
- o Relating climate change to health;
- o Developing multiple messages and messengers.

- **Environmental Stewardship**
  Including, for example:
  - o Increasing composting and waste reduction;
  - o Banning recyclables and green waste from landfills;
  - o Decreasing water use;
  - o Linking water conservation to "Spare the Air;
  - o Launching a "native plant" program to conserve water and reduce waste;
  - o Encouraging local foods;
  - o Modernizing storm water regulations.

- **Environmental Equity**
  Including, for example:
  - o Initiating climate justice projects and programs to reduce differential climate impact on disadvantage communities
  - o Addressing equity issues in cap and trading programs for greenhouse gases.

- **Leadership and Coordination**
  Including, for example:
  - o Overseeing multiple efforts on multiple fronts;
  - o Articulating clear and consistent goals, shared values and common priorities;
  - o Partnering to reduce duplication and reinvention;
  - o Providing strong links to state efforts;
  - o Encouraging and supporting local, business and NGO efforts;
  - o Developing a consolidated plan to cap emissions and attain climate-change objectives;
  - o Advocating for legislation;
  - o Supporting legal defenses of climate actions;
  - o Helping to build political will.